

Appl. No. 09/965,534
Amdt. Dated September 2, 2003
Reply to Final Office Action of April 2, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 81790.0219
Customer No. 26021

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Advisory Action dated July 28, 2003, and in conjunction with the filing of a Request for Continued Examination for the above identified patent application, no claims are amended. Claims 1-10 remain in the application. It is not the Applicants' intent to surrender any equivalents because of the amendments or arguments made herein. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

Response to Advisory Action

In the Advisory Action, the specific element of claims 11-13 (now incorporated in independent claims 1, 5, and 7, respectively) was considered allowable subject matter, but was considered absent in the specification prior to the final rejection. The Applicant respectfully traverses in light of the arguments presented herein.

Claim 1

The "delay adjustment signal output circuit" recited in claim 1, which is a parent claim of claim 11, corresponds, for instance, to "the decode circuit 13" described on page 14, line 12 of the original specification and illustrated in FIG.1. Furthermore, "the data signals" in the same claim corresponds, for instance, to "the n bit read data RD (RD₁ to RD_n)" described on page 12, line 6 of the original specification and illustrated in FIG.1, and the "delay adjustment signals" corresponds, for instance, to "the delay adjustment signals DPSW (DPSW₁ to DPSW_n)" described on page 12, last line of the original specification and illustrated in FIG.1.

Appl. No. 09/965,534
Amdt. Dated September 2, 2003
Reply to Final Office Action of April 2, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 81790.0219
Customer No. 26021

An example of circuit for “the decode circuit 13” is illustrated in FIGS.5 and 6, and its operation is as described from page 14, line 23 to page 15, line 21 of the original specification. This part of the original specification discloses that the values of the delay adjustment signals DPSW1 to DPSW4 vary in accordance with the data pattern of the read data RD1 to RD4. For example, the following descriptions are included: when the data pattern is “0001” or “1110”, the delay adjustment signal DPSW1 = “HIGH” is output (page 15, lines 2 to 4), and when the data pattern is “0010” or “1101”, the delay adjustment signal DPSW2 = “HIGH” is output (page 15, line 14).

In contrast, claim 1 recites, “values of the delay adjustment signals change in accordance with data pattern of the data signals”. This recitation is supported by the description in the original specification from page 14, line 23 to page 15, line 21.

Therefore, the addition of the language of the response to the Final Office Action does not add new matter. Claim 11, which was considered allowable and is now incorporated in independent claim 1, was supported by the original specification, and therefore, should be in order for allowance.

Claims 12 and 13

Similarly to claim 11, the specific element recited in claim 12 (now independent claim 5) is supported, for instance, by the description from page 23, lines 14 to 26 of the original specification and FIG.12.

The specific element recited in Claim 13 (now independent claim 7) is supported, for instance, by the description from page 24, line 14 to page 25, last line of the original specification (in particular, page 25, lines 14 to 23 thereof) and FIG.13.

Therefore, the addition of the language of the response to the Final Office Action does not add new matter. Claims 12 and 13, which were considered

Appl. No. 09/965,534
Amdt. Dated September 2, 2003
Reply to Final Office Action of April 2, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 81790.0219
Customer No. 26021

allowable and are now incorporated in independent claims 5 and 7 respectively, were supported by the original specification, and therefore, claims 5 and 7 should be in order for allowance.

Claims 2-4, 6, and 8-10 are also in order for allowance because they depend on claims on independent 1, 5, and 7 not only because they contain all of the limitations of the independent claims, but also because claims 2-4, 6, and 8-10 also describe additional novel elements and features that are not described in the prior art.

Conclusion

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6742 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: September 2, 2003

By:



Anthony J. Orler
Registration No. 41,232
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701